

THE PASSING OF EDMUND S. MUSKIE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday, the State of Maine and the entire Nation mourned the loss of a political giant, Edmund S. Muskie.

From Maine to California, the newspapers are filled with long stories detailing and encapsulating the life and times of Ed Muskie and his accomplishments. There were columns that appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Boston Globe, the Bangor Daily News, the Portland Press Herald—all across the country.

While each of the articles was written from the unique perspective of the authors, there were common elements in each one of them. The articles spoke of Senator Muskie's intellect, which indeed was muscular. They spoke of his integrity, which was unquestioned. They spoke of his candor, which was unmatched. They spoke of his courage, which I think was incomparable.

He took on some of the most powerful interests in this country and, never once, did he ever flinch, he never sought favor, and never acted out of fear. He was indeed a brave heart.

He was careful, and some say he was cautious.

I read a tribute recently, which I will quote:

Perhaps the strongest feature in his character was prudence, never acting until every circumstance, every consideration, was maturely weighed; refraining when he saw doubt, but when once decided, going through with his purpose whatever obstacles opposed. His integrity was the most pure, his justice the most inflexible I have ever known, no motives or interest or consanguinity, or friendship or hatred being able to bias his decision. He was indeed, in every sense of the words, a wise, a good, and a great man.

These words were not about Ed Muskie. These are the words of Thomas Jefferson assessing the character of George Washington. But they might just as well have been said about Ed Muskie.

In Ecclesiastes, the question is asked, "What is best for men to do during their few days of life under the sun?"

Well, it was clear from the very beginning what the answer was for Ed Muskie. He was not born to be a spectator or a bystander. He did not come into this world to sit in a darkened theater and express his approval or rejection of those on stage.

He knew, as Justice Holmes before him knew, that "Life is action and passion, and we must share in that action and passion at the risk of being judged not to have lived."

Ed Muskie was at the very center of the action of his days—whether it was on the civil rights legislation, or protecting the environment, or waging the fight to control the budget, as chairman of the Budget Committee, or promoting America's role in a dangerous world, as the Secretary of State.

When he was on the Senate floor in full-throated debate, and when he blended that magnificent mind of his

with the rhetorical power and grace of the orator, then he became one with the poet Hopkins, who said, "What I do is for me; for this I care."

Dr. Robert Sheehan once wrote, "The world belongs to those who laugh and cry. Laughter is the beginning of wisdom, the first evidence of the divine sense of humor. Those who know laughter have learned the secret of living."

Well, Ed laughed a lot. He had a wry, down-east Yankee wit. He loved a good cigar, a good story, and he loved a good joke.

While passion was his virtue, it was also said to be his vice. He had a cool, cerebral intellect, but he also had a quick and, some would say, also Vesuvian temper, particularly when he witnessed an injustice being done, an act of hypocrisy or unfairness being inflicted. He had little tolerance for character assassination.

We are all familiar with that fateful moment in New Hampshire when he was standing on a flatbed during a snowfall. Ed Muskie decided that he had enough of the dirty tricks that were being practiced upon him at that time, enough of the daily diatribes that appeared in one of New Hampshire's newspapers. But, of course, he was not the only object of attack that week. He rose on that day to denounce the attacks against his wife, Jane, as being mean and cowardly. There was one prominent journalist, David Broder, who wrote that Senator Muskie appeared to be crying during that time—although, to this day, there is some question as to whether they were actually snowflakes falling or streaming down his cheeks, as opposed to tears.

But it was a moment in history—a turning point in his campaign for the Presidency because many, after that moment, judged him to be too passionate to be President.

There is some irony in the retelling of this story and this event because, some 16 years later, another Democratic candidate for the Presidency was thought to be too cool, too bland, and bloodless in his response to a question about what he would do if his wife had been raped.

So we have come to learn that politics is not a sport where the rules are always well defined, or indeed consistent.

Some people who have run unsuccessfully for the Presidency are broken by the experience. Defeat never shattered Ed Muskie's love of politics and his love for this institution. He possessed an inner self-confidence and self-awareness of his place in the uncompleted puzzle of existence. It was a serenity which permitted him to continue to serve nobly in the Senate and then later as Secretary of State.

Mr. President, back in 1976, I had given consideration to running against Senator Muskie. I was then a young Congressman from the Second Congressional District of Maine. I was being urged, indeed, to run against Senator

Muskie. I was pondering. I thought about it for a long time. I retreated to Sugarloaf Mountain in Maine to contemplate whether or not I would take this great step. I had with me at that time a book called "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance" written by Robert Pirsig. It was one of the most intellectually challenging books I think I had read at that time.

As I was reading through the book, the decision really clicked into my mind. I came across the words of Pirsig when he said:

When you try to climb a mountain to prove how big you are, you almost never make it. And even if you do, it's a hollow victory. In order to sustain the victory you have to prove yourself again and again in some other way, and again and again and again, driven forever to fill a false image, haunted by the fear that the image is not true and someone will find out. That's never the way. . . .

I knew, upon reading these words, that I was in danger of letting my own ambition race beyond my abilities and that even if I could defeat Ed Muskie—and the polls showed me doing that—I knew in my heart that I would need a fistful of four-leaf clovers and a whole lot of money. Even then in my heart of hearts I knew that it would be a tough race for me to run, and that, even if I were to win—which was always in doubt—the State of Maine and this country would not have been well served. He was by far a superior man, and history has proven that to be the case.

So I declined to enter the race. I called Ed Muskie and told him of my decision—never revealing at that time that I had been reading "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance" which helped me reach that conclusion.

John Kennedy once remarked that when the high court of history sits in judgment on each of us, recording in our brief span of service whether we fulfilled our responsibilities, our success will be measured by the answers to four questions:

First, were we truly men of courage?

Second, were we truly men of judgment?

Third, were we truly men of integrity?

Fourth, were we truly men of dedication?

As history judges Ed Muskie, the answer to each of these questions is an unqualified "yes." These are the very qualities that characterized his service in Government. He will be remembered as one of the finest public servants to ever have graced the Governor's Mansion in Maine, the U.S. Senate, and the Office of Secretary of State.

Tomorrow when he is laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery, Ed Muskie will be in the hearts and in the minds of the people of Maine and this country and shall remain there for generations to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

WELFARE REFORM

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, it has been 37 months since President Clinton outlined his welfare reform goals. On February 2, 1993, he told the Nation's Governors he would announce the formation of a welfare reform group within 10 days to work with the Governors to develop a welfare reform plan. But welfare reform was not enacted that year nor the following year.

Fourteen months ago, President Clinton declared at a joint session of Congress that, "Nothing has done more to undermine our sense of common responsibility than our failed welfare system. It rewards welfare over work. It undermines family values."

In response, the new Congress passed welfare reform twice in 1995. H.R. 4, the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1995, received bipartisan support in both the House and Senate as it was being drafted. Yet, 10 weeks ago, President Clinton vetoed welfare reform for a second time. With a stroke of his pen, President Clinton wiped out the welfare reform American families need and expect. By vetoing welfare reform, President Clinton has accepted the status quo in which millions of children are trapped in a vicious cycle of dependency.

Two weeks after he vetoed H.R. 4 President Clinton once again pledged his support for welfare reform in his 1996 State of the Union Address.

The President also declared that, "the era of big government is over." But his actions contradict his words.

On February 6, the Nation's Governors issued their own bold challenge to reform the welfare state. The Governors' unanimously adopted a bipartisan—I emphasize "a bipartisan"—blueprint for returning the power and authority over the welfare system, including Medicaid, to the States. Since then, the Finance Committee has held three hearings on the welfare and Medicaid proposals forwarded by the National Governors' Association. The Governors specifically built upon the welfare reform conference report rejected by the President.

On February 28, Secretary Shalala testified for the administration on the Governors' proposals. Once again, we found that the administration has an incredible capacity to blow hot and cold air at the same time. While lauding the Governors for their effort, Secretary Shalala opposed every major provision of the bipartisan proposals.

The Nation's Governors assembled again this week, this time in Palisades, NY, for a National Education Summit. The purpose of this meeting was for the States to share their ideas and strategies for introducing new technologies, standards, and assessments to improve the education of our children.

The Governors invited the business leaders who will help develop the new learning systems which will combine education and technology. The Governors also invited President Clinton to address the summit and, who no

doubt, pledged his support and commitment to our children's future.

But among all of the dignitaries, there was an uninvited and unwelcome guest at the banquet. Medicaid, the uninvited guest, will consume much of the necessary resources intended for education and will leave only scraps for the education of our children.

The insatiable appetite of Medicaid spending is limiting the ability of the Governors to fully fund education as they wish as Medicaid's share of State spending has nearly doubled in just 7 years. Its share has grown from 10 percent of State spending in 1987 to 19.4 in 1994.

During this same time, the share of State spending for elementary and secondary education dropped from 22.8 to 20.3 percent. Higher education's share dropped from 12.3 to 10.5 percent.

In 1990, Medicaid spending replaced higher education as the second largest State spending category, exceeded only by elementary and secondary education.

If present trends continue, Medicaid will soon pass elementary and secondary education as well. As shares of total State spending, both elementary and secondary education and higher education are at their lowest point in memory.

Between fiscal years 1993 and 1994, elementary and secondary education grew by just 2 percent. In comparison, Medicaid grew by more than 12 percent.

These alarming trends have consequences in other vital services as well. Transportation's share has dropped from 10.6 percent of State spending to 8.9 percent. The broad category of all other which includes public safety, investment in infrastructure, and many other services has declined 3 percentage points.

Another hidden threat of Medicaid is how State government is funded. Medicaid forces States to borrow more to finance the cost of education.

States cannot sell bonds to finance Medicaid, so the cost and burden of borrowing is passed on to other budget categories.

In 1987, 6.4 percent of bonds issued were to finance higher education. In 1984, 19.2 percent of bonds were used to fund higher education. This debt, of course, is ultimately passed on to our children. Even worse, as Medicaid spending consumes even greater shares of spending, leaving less for education, the cost of education may well rise beyond the ability of many families to spend their children to college to all.

The consequences of the failed welfare system are realized in many ways. It spreads its ill effects throughout society.

Now we find that unlimited entitlement spending threatens our democratic institutions as well. Mandatory Medicaid spending is draining State and Federal budgets. Governors and State legislatures are no longer in control of their State governments—they are being held hostage by the demands of Federal bureaucrats.

Mr. President, if we truly care about the education and future of our children, we must enact authentic welfare reform. Medicaid is the largest welfare program and the threat of its uncontrolled growth is spreading. Without welfare and Medicaid reform, whatever President Clinton promised for education last Wednesday in New York, is certain to be consumed by Medicaid tomorrow.

Mr. President, I yield back the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for roughly 10 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST SALMON RESTORATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Columbia River is the crown jewel of our Pacific Northwest. Its waters passing through our dams light our cities and towns. Its waters held back at times by those dams have saved thousands of lives from destructive floods. Its waters spread on our dry land have made the desert bloom and provide food for millions of people around the world. At the same time, that magnificent Columbia River has been the home to the most munificent runs of salmon anywhere in the lower 48 States of the United States of America.

Now that very civilization that has built those dams and used these waters so constructively threatens the future of these wonderful salmon runs. What should we do? How should we see to it that we both have the benefits of power and of irrigation and flood control and at the same time preserve and strengthen and restore these wonderful runs of salmon?

I think it is becoming more and more evident what we should not do. In the last 5 years, Federal bureaucrats here in Washington, DC, have billed us in the Pacific Northwest \$1.5 billion for salmon restoration, half a billion dollars last year alone, and we have not seen any positive results at all. In spite of this investment, an investment the people of the Pacific Northwest have not begrudged, the results are nothing. The results are a continued decline in our salmon runs. These costs are welcomed by the people of the Pacific Northwest, but the results are not.

I am convinced that this failure of Washington, DC, bureaucrats means that we cannot succeed if we continue to do business in the same way that we are doing it at the present time. I believe, and I believe firmly, that we can do a far better job in the Pacific Northwest if we are allowed to make the decisions that affect our lives and affect our resources.

Personally, I am totally committed to restoring an abundant salmon fishery in the Columbia and the Snake Rivers. Healthy and strong salmon